

actions are akin to the type of abuse and vendettas we saw during Watergate.

When it comes to ethics, this is an Administration that has gone to extremes to avoid independent scrutiny. Whether it is investigating the President's friend Ken Lay or his Secretary of the Army Thomas White for their involvement in the Enron Fraud; Vice President CHENEY for his involvement in financial fraud by Halliburton; or the involvement of top Republican legislators in trading campaign contributions for legislative favors on behalf of Westar, in the instances the Attorney General has not seen fit to open a single independent investigation.

LACK OF CREDIBILITY IN THIS ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to focus attention on the lack of credibility of this administration. This administration has been revealed for attempting to mislead the American public, and they certainly have mismanaged this so-called Iraqi freedom war. This administration's credibility is on the line, and let me recount some of the reasons why.

Every American now knows that there are no weapons of mass destruction, that this administration claimed they knew about, had identified and could document in Iraq. They even claimed that they had the drones that do surveillance that were capable of carrying weapons of mass destruction. That has been debunked. That is not true. They also claimed and there were weeks of stories in the paper about the President's claim that Saddam Hussein had attempted to purchase yellow cake, or uranium, from Niger. That has been found not to be true.

□ 1945

They claimed and tried to mislead the American public in several ways. They have been caught trying to tie 9/11 to Saddam Hussein, and they have had to back off of it, and they have looked rather foolish in doing that.

But, really, to underscore this lack of credibility, imagine that Karl Rove, sitting at the right hand of the President of the United States, had the audacity, the temerity to call the press and to out an undercover CIA agent and the wife of an ambassador. Not only did he break the law, he endangered the life of this woman. And this is a man who is calling the shots in the White House, again whispering into the ear of the President, guiding and leading him.

They also claimed, as they bombed Iraq, that Iraq would be rebuilt with the oil resources. We know that they secured the oil fields when they landed. And they told us that they would be pumping the oil and that the revenues from that oil would pay for the rebuilding. Well, those are just a few of the instances of misleading information, dis-

tortions, information that has managed to confuse the American people and create a lot of distrust.

But I am not going to concentrate all of my 5 minutes on that. That story has been written. And I do not care how they try to do their little mini shake-up and pretend that Rumsfeld is not the point person that he is, and drag out Condoleezza Rice, who is supposed to put a better spin on it than Rumsfeld. I do not care how they try to do that. The fact of the matter is, the American people are unhappy.

We are unhappy when we look at the request for \$87 billion that this President has asked the American public to ante up, this \$87 billion at a time when the economy is not well. When we have lost over 3.5 million jobs, where people are trying to make ends meet, cannot pay their bills and have plants that are closing down every day, the President asks the American people to ante up \$87 billion because he is proposing to spend \$850 million on Iraqi health care, including \$150 million for a new Children's Hospital.

The number of uninsured Americans has grown to 43.6 million in 2002, up from 41 million in 2001. There are 8.5 million children without health insurance. And I can keep on going. They want to do some housing in Iraq. The President proposes to spend \$470 million on housing and construction, including \$100 million to build 3,528 new houses in Iraq. How many Members of Congress could use some new housing in their districts?

In the United States, we are experiencing a housing shortage on an unprecedented scale. According to the Millennium Housing Commission, there is currently a 1.8 million unit gap between the number of extremely low-income households and the number of affordable rental units available for these households.

But let us not stop there. Let us move on to education. The President's proposal includes distributing 5 million science and math books, 1.2 million school supply kits for students, and as many as 1,000 primary schools are being rehabbed. One Member on the other side of the aisle got on the floor and showed us the brand new book bags they bought for all of the children of Iraq. I had to remind him that children in my district do not even have books to put in a book bag.

The President's signature program, No Child Left Behind, is underfunded by \$8 billion. While we are witnessing this in this country, think about the lack of credibility that this administration has created with the way it has done these contracts.

An August 28 Washington Post article noted that Halliburton, the company formerly headed by Vice President CHENEY, has won contracts worth more than a couple billion dollars under Operation Iraqi Freedom and stands to make hundreds of millions of dollars more under a no-bid contract awarded by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Bechtel has earned at least \$350 million.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and on. But every night Members will be coming to the floor talking about the lack of credibility, the mismanagement and the shock and awe campaign that was put on. Well, Mr. President, we are going to shock and awe you. Mr. President, you are going to be shocked when the people speak out and decide that they do not want this kind of representation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). Members are reminded not to address their remarks to those outside the Chamber.

SANCTITY OF HUMAN LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise again now for the second time in this Chamber to address an issue that, while we passed significant legislation concerning partial-birth abortion recently, truthfully the Congress does very little to speak to what I believe is the defining issue of our time: namely, the questions and debates surrounding the sanctity of human life.

So, Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I initiated on the floor of this Congress what I hope will become a series during my tenure here, a series of conversations between myself and other Members of Congress who care deeply about this debate and where we might explore the historical and intellectual and moral foundations of the right to life.

It seems altogether fitting that we do it here, in this Congress and in this place. Because this is not only the House of the people, but it is the place throughout the history of this Nation where not only have we come together to debate the urgent needs of the country but also we have come to this place and in this building for over 200 years to discuss those things which are, while not urgent to some, they are important to the fabric of the Nation. In my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, restoring a fundamental understanding about the sanctity of human life and its central position in the development of notions of justice in western civilization is without a doubt the most significant issue of our day.

I was inspired by none other than a former member of this body, John Quincy Adams, who, prior to being a 20-year Member of Congress was, of course, President of the United States of America. But as he served in the Chamber just adjacent to this one, where the Congress met for much of the 19th century, John Quincy Adams

was known to be a man about one cause, and that was abolition. In fact, former President and then Congressman John Quincy Adams was a man who came to be known by his detractors as the hell hound of Abolition, because Congressman and former President John Quincy Adams would come into this place, history records, and week after week through his 20-year career in Congress he made the case against slavery.

As someone who believes in my heart that the decision that the United States Supreme Court rendered in 1973, a decision which has resulted in the legal abortion of nearly a million and a half children every year since, requires that we employ the same device of debate and discussion that John Quincy Adams employed, it is my hope, Mr. Speaker, to do as he did, to prick the conscience of the Nation, or even our own colleagues, to think deeply in their hearts and in their minds about this notion of the sanctity of life.

To do that, I have called upon a variety of sources, some of which I will cite tonight. I begin tonight, as I hope to reflect on that historical debate that John Quincy Adams so notably brought to this floor, with a quote from Martin Luther King, Jr., in his letter from the Birmingham jail.

Some may think, well, why is a lawmaker, why is the Chamber where laws are made, worried about something that is a moral issue? In fact, I received just a few days ago a letter from a constituent who voiced that often-repeated phrase that they did not want me to impose my moral views on them, believing that they were referring to my views on the right to life. Well, on that very issue the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote, "A just law is man-made code that squares with the moral law of God. Unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law of God."

In fact, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the German Lutheran pastor who was martyred for resisting Adolf Hitler, gave what may be the clearest expression of this principle when he said, "If government persistently and arbitrarily violates its assigned task, then the divine mandate lapses." In the case of Pastor Bonhoeffer and the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. the principle is the same: It is the notion that there is a law higher than what we can conceive of here; and, dare I say it, Mr. Speaker, there is even a law higher than the contemporary decisions of the United States Supreme Court, that there is a law that rises unerringly out of history, and it is that moral law of which the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., wrote from that Birmingham jail.

A Rabbi pastor said famously in my presence once, "No one ever breaks God's law, they just break themselves against it." And what is true of individuals can undoubtedly be true of nations. Nations that set themselves against the moral law and moral truth fail to break that law so much as they break themselves.

Certainly that was the case in 19th century America, was it not, Mr. Speaker? For in 19th century America, while the Congressman and former President John Quincy Adams came to this floor week after week and argued the moral approbation of slavery, argued for the abolition of slavery, America slept, believing that it could break that moral law and still survive. And as we learned, following the elections of 1860 and the secession of southern States and 600,000 battle deaths later, the truth is, Mr. Speaker, America did not succeed in breaking the moral law, but America broke itself against that simple notion of human dignity, that one man ought not to be able, in a just society, to enslave another man, and to put him, as Abraham Lincoln would say in his second inaugural address, under the pain of the whip.

□ 2000

It was in that second inaugural address that he spoke of the Civil War. He spoke of the Civil War as a time when we were paying the debt that justice demanded of a nation. It is altogether fitting, I think, that tonight in this part of the case for life that we reflect on some of the similarities, eerie similarities between that debate over the personhood of men and women of African descent enslaved as they were in the Nation and the contemporary debate over abortion today because there are, as the author Gary Henry wrote in Focus magazine in June 1997, "There are, most assuredly, parallels between the debate over abortion today and the intellectual and moral debate and arguments made against slavery." It is almost eerie at times how the parallels between the arguments of those 150 years ago advocating slavery rights match with the arguments of personal choice that support abortion today.

Most notably of course was we had a Supreme Court case out of step with the truth. It was a case decided in 1857 known as the Dred Scott decision. In that case the Supreme Court ruled, and many will forget, that slaves, even freed slaves, and all their descendants had no rights protected by the Constitution and that States had no right to abolish slavery. The reasoning in Dred Scott is historically and intellectually almost identical to the reasoning that would be employed in 1973 in a decision known as Roe v. Wade.

It was a reasoning that was centered on the definition of a person. In the Dred Scott case, the Court stripped away all rights from a class of human beings and reduced them to nothing more than the property of others. We can compare the arguments that the Court used to justify slavery and abortion very clearly. In the Court's eyes, the Supreme Court in Roe v. Wade and its predecessor cases and progeny, unborn children are now the same as, quote, "the beings of inferior order" that the justices wrote of in the Dred Scott decision in 1857.

There are other similarities. An African American was considered a non-

person under the Constitution as the case of an unborn child was considered a nonperson. In fact, an African American in slavery and any of their progeny were considered the property of the owner, and in Roe v. Wade the unborn child is simply considered the property of the mother in a legal sense.

It is truly astonishing even to recall that the Dred Scott case was decided by a 7-2 decision in the Supreme Court, the exact same number of justices that voted for and against the right to an abortion in Roe v. Wade.

It is extraordinary to think that the words "citizens" or "persons" used in the Constitution, according to the Dred Scott decision, were never intended to include African Americans; and according to Roe v. Wade, the term "citizens" and "persons" as used in the Constitution were never intended to include unborn children.

Listen to these cryptic words from the Dred Scott case of 1857. The Supreme Court wrote: "A Negro, whose ancestors were imported into this country, and sold as slaves, were not intended to be included under the word 'citizen' in the Constitution, and can, therefore, claim none of the rights and privileges which that instrument provides for and secures to citizens of the United States."

Here are the words now from the Roe v. Wade decision in 1973. The Supreme Court wrote: "The word 'person,' as used in the 14th amendment, does not include the unborn. The unborn have never been recognized in the law," Justice Blackmun wrote for the majority "as persons in the whole sense."

So while there may be some looking in on our debate tonight who may think I cannot believe that conservative from Indiana is stretching to somehow connect the debate over slavery in 1857 before the Supreme Court in Dred Scott and the debate over a woman's right to choose an abortion which took place before the Supreme Court in 1973, the person might surmise there is no connection, but the truth is I learned in my very first class in law school on this topic, not only are they analogous, they are almost one to one parallels. Listen to those words again. In the Dred Scott in 1857 the Supreme Court said: "A Negro, whose ancestors were imported into this country, and sold as slaves, were not intended to be included under the word 'citizen' in the Constitution, and can, therefore, claim none of the rights and privileges which that instrument provides for and secures to citizens of the United States."

And in Roe v. Wade, they wrote the word "person" does not include the unborn. The unborn have never been recognized in the law; it is persons in the whole sense.

There are other parallels between the decision in the Dred Scott case. The Dred Scott case of 1857 essentially said a slave is the property of the master and the Constitution has provided "the protection of private property against the encroachments of government."

Literally the Supreme Court in 1857 brought out the idea of private property rights. In a very real sense the idea of privacy and the right to privacy that ostensibly emerges, as Justice Blackmun would write, the Bill of Rights was the very foundation of the Dred Scott decision. In the *Roe v. Wade* case in 1973, the Supreme Court said of that right: "The right of privacy is broad enough to encompass a woman's decision whether or not to terminate her pregnancy."

It is truly astonishing to think of the parallels, and it seems to me to be altogether fitting that we would amplify those. As we think about coming upon the 50th anniversary of the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, I am someone who believes in my heart that the steady advance of civil rights in this country to every American is the glory of this Nation, that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the single greatest legislative accomplishment of the 20th century, and we as Americans ought to take enormous pride in the fact that our forebearers were willing to confront and reject the ethos of their time of some Americans, and even a 7-2 decision by the Supreme Court, that certified that Negroes were never to be counted among the citizens protected in the Constitution. It is because of their courage, their willingness to confront both the awesome power of the Supreme Court and their own countrymen that we arrive in a Nation today of increasing justice for all.

In fact, one cannot help but wonder, as I have since the first days I studied American history at a small college on the Ohio River Valley, one cannot help but wonder if the 600,000 lives that were lost in the Civil War, the families that were sundered in the Civil War, the wounds that in some respects 150 years later we find ourselves as a Nation still recovering from might have been altogether avoided if America had done as England had done some 25 years earlier and recognized that a practice in their midst certified by the highest courts in the land, and through traditions of decades, was simply and flatly morally wrong. But we did not.

Different than the United Kingdom that not only denounced slavery because of the leadership and 40-year campaign of a member of Parliament named William Wilberforce, not only did England denounce slavery and make it illegal, but they also declared war on slavery on the seven seas. And the holocaust of the Civil War that struck our country never came to England. And anyone that has ever visited or spent time in England knows that the division between the races is fundamentally better and less defined than in this Nation because England, before they were forced into the cataclysm that we met as a Nation in 1861 in the Civil War, shuffled off that conflict between their law and what was legal and the moral law and moral truth.

In fact, it was John Quincy Adams who I opened with tonight who would go to the floor of Congress and argue against the fundamental immorality of slavery, literally using his last breath, collapsing on the floor of Congress to argue against slavery in America. He was carried out and expired in the year 1848. He died in this very building. Some might look at John Quincy Adams, as some looking in tonight might look at me, and say speaking empty words, not making any change. John Quincy Adams died almost a decade before the Dred Scott decision. Some of his contemporaries might have said, what did he think he accomplished. But I submit very humbly that John Quincy Adams, on Earth and in heaven, accomplished a great deal because history does record that in 1848, the last year of his life, was the first year of a freshman Congressman from Illinois, a gangly, and by his own definition, a homely man, named Abe Lincoln. Born in Kentucky, moved at the age of 2 to the State of Indiana where he grew up until he was 19 on a little farm on which I have walked in southwestern Indiana.

He came to the United States Congress in 1848 and history would record that Abraham Lincoln, sitting in the back row as a freshman Member of Congress, listening to the great man John Quincy Adams speak would be deeply moved by one who was then known as the "hell hound of abolition." One can only imagine the sallow cheeks of a young and beardless Abe Lincoln sitting in the back row wondering, what is the grand old man making all the fuss about, slavery being so deeply ensconced in the industrial and legal tradition of America at the time.

But he listened and he heard, and it would be just 10 years later after leaving Congress that same Abe Lincoln, who our children in grade school know as President Abraham Lincoln, would run again for public office; but this time he was in a very real sense a changed man. He would enter a race in Illinois against Stephen Douglas for the Senate, a race that he would lose, but it would capture the imagination of America because of a series of debates known as the Lincoln-Douglas debates. And in those debates, more than any other political exercise of the age, Abraham Lincoln defined the moral dimensions of the wrongness of slavery in America.

The irony is among those who say you have to soften our position on abortion in contemporary debate because you could lose elections, well, that same advice could have been given to Abraham Lincoln because he certainly lost that campaign for the Senate, being as focused as he was on that issue. But it was precisely his courage and his unapologetic moral case for the wrongness and the injustice of denying personhood, denying the fundamental constitutional rights to an entire class of human beings that would propel him to his party's nomination for President of the United States.

□ 2015

And he would be elected, and upon his election the Nation would divide and be torn by war.

As we look at those Lincoln and Douglas debates, the arguments that candidate Abraham Lincoln made are extraordinary. He makes the case about the fundamental immorality of slavery; and for all the world, and I intend to do it during the course of these conversations about life, Mr. Speaker, we can take entire tracks of Abraham Lincoln's remarks in the Lincoln and Douglas debates and we can pull out the word "slavery" and put in the word "abortion" and the sentence makes perfect sense as he speaks about the denial of the fundamental right to life and liberty to a class of human beings in America.

He spoke about it not in the context of established law, but as we know from history, as did the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in his letter from the Birmingham jail, he spoke about it in the context of the moral law of God.

I close this installment, Mr. Speaker, of the case for life as I began it with those extraordinary reflections of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. But I close it with a recognition that it is not just high principle and history that calls us in this place to an account to restore the fundamental notion that life is sacred but rather there are lives, I offer humbly, not gratuitously, by the millions that cry out from someplace that they are and that we someday will be, and they call upon us as a Nation to right what has gone so wrong. The latest statistics from the Alan Guttmacher Institute estimates 43,358,592 total abortions since 1973.

King David, when he lost his son, experiencing the justice of God, washed his face after a period of grief and said that his mourning was over. When his friends and colleagues asked him how he could move on, he said of his son, "I will go to him but he will not again come to me."

I believe in all my heart that those 43 plus million souls have gone to a place where by God's grace I hope someday to go, but I believe that they cry out to America and to their own generation, not a word of condemnation because I expect that when we are done here, when we know ourselves even as we are known, our natural tendency to judge others will fade significantly.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in that same spirit, that it is my fondest hope that, as I have the privilege of serving in this body, I from time to time come to this floor even with other colleagues and make the case for life in a way that is truly brokenhearted, in a way that is brokenhearted not just about the 43 million who are not here but about the 43 million who were led into making that choice and the broken hearts in their lives that they feel, because I truly do believe, Mr. Speaker, that whether it is individuals or nations that we do not break God's law, we break ourselves against it.

As the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said in the letter from the Birmingham jail, and we should heed this as we consider someday the ideal of restoring the sanctity of human life, "A just law is man-made code that squares with the moral law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law."

Martin Luther King was right. Abortion is wrong, and it is my deepest and fondest hope that through peaceful means, as Dr. King led America through debate, through engagement, through compassion, that we will lead our Nation back to where the man-made code will again square with the moral law of God and we will someday restore the sanctity of human life.

QUESTIONS FOR THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the topic of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I come tonight to address this House along with my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus, and I guess one thing, as I heard our previous speaker talking about Martin Luther King, I could not help but think about a quote that King stated many years ago when he said that when you talk about peace, it is not just the absence of conflict but it is the presence of justice.

And tonight the Congressional Black Caucus, as we did last week and we will continue to do over and over again, come forward in the spirit of justice, justice with regard to the American people, who have a right to know what is going on in their country and with the tax dollars that they work so hard to give to our national Treasury. I think they want justice so that they can fully understand why it is that just a few months ago the President came asking for close to \$80 billion and this Congress gave it to him for Iraq. I think they will consider justice to simply be that they now have answers to the questions with regard to the present \$87 billion, questions answered which will help them understand what is going on and why it is that their tax dollars are being spent.

Those same citizens, like the Congressional Black Caucus, are very clear with regard to support of our troops. We support our troops with everything we have got. As I often say, we support our troops 1 million percent, but the fact is that, if justice is to prevail and

if peace is to really come to this world, we also need to know and the American citizens need to know whether those troops, while we applaud them over and over again, whether they are receiving justice when they ask the question and send the letters to their congressmen and to their representatives and to their Senators asking what do we have to do to get the things that we need to address this war that we are in?

So I want to make it very clear that there is not the slightest bit of reluctance to support our troops. We do. But now we must begin to answer some questions, and we presented these questions to the President before, and we will present them over and over again.

Recently, we in the Congressional Black Caucus released the principles that will guide our evaluation of the administration's \$87 billion supplemental funding request regarding the United States' involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan. This latest \$87 billion request, I should note, is in addition to the \$80 billion that Congress appropriated just last spring.

In the Congressional Black Caucus statement of principles, we declared the following: The administration should provide to the Congress the full details of the information relied upon by the President in his decision to go to war. We asked for a detailed accounting from the administration as to all funds expended to date, including details about all contracts for works in or related to Iraq. We asserted that the President should provide full details about how the efforts will be paid for, including a full accounting of how and to what extent Iraqi resources could be used to reduce the United States' costs. We indicated that the President should provide the Congress with a detailed plan showing how the proposed new funding will be spent, distinguishing between what will be used for the protection and maintenance of our troops and what will be used for the rebuilding of Iraq.

We went on to say, and we declare that the President should provide full details about the future obligations of the United States and about how responsibility and authority for these obligations will be shared with the United Nations and other nations around the world. And we asked that the President set forth the criteria he will expect to be met before bringing our troops home.

Mr. Speaker, next week this House will vote on the administration's \$87 billion request. Personally and on behalf of my colleagues within the Congressional Black Caucus, I once again pledge our unwavering support for our troops. We must provide our brave young men and women with all the resources they need to complete their mission and return home as soon as possible.

I suggest, however, that our evaluation of the administration's supplemental funding request requires further consideration of what precisely

the mission of our troops in Iraq will be from this point forward. That question is central to the last four CBC principles that I just mentioned, and it is central to the concerns of the 26 million Americans the Congressional Black Caucus members represent.

I must note that we are being asked to appropriate this \$87 billion, more than twice the amount of the entire Homeland Security Department's fiscal year 2004 budget. I must also acknowledge that we have not yet provided the Federal funding needed by our States and local governments to assure the security of our people right here at home.

I believe that there is substantial support in this House for a continuing and significant United States role in the rebuilding of Iraq and the transition of Iraq to a democratic peaceful society. Once again, however, we are faced with a critical issue of national policy. Must the United States substantially go it alone in financing the reconstruction of Iraq? Or, in the alternative, will the administration be able to obtain substantial United Nations involvement and financial participation?

The answers to these questions will be central to our evaluation of the administration's \$87 billion request and especially the \$20 billion plus requested for rebuilding Iraq.

As I speak, Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposed resolution seeking U.N. support is in trouble within the United Nations Security Council. The critical question appears to be this: Who will control the reconstruction of Iraq, the United Nations or the United States? We also rapidly are approaching the International Donors Conference in Madrid which is scheduled for October 27. The administration is maintaining the position that we, not the U.N., must remain in control of the Iraq process. This is the current situation. We in the Congress are being asked to approve another \$87 billion in American funds at a time when we are filled with uncertainty.

□ 2030

The questions that the Congressional Black Caucus have posed have not yet been answered. We are uncertain about the role of the UN; we are uncertain about what other nations will come forward to help pay the costs and how much they are prepared to contribute.

What we can reasonably conclude is this: Unless the United States is prepared to share power and control regarding the future of Iraq with the United Nations, we cannot reasonably anticipate that other major nations will be willing to share any substantial portion of the costs. In addition, thus far we have seen very little reference in the administration's proposals with respect to the appropriate use of Iraq's own resources to help rebuild the Middle Eastern Nation.

I should also note that according to an examination the Marshall Plan